Data Submitted (UTC 11): 9/4/2020 6:00:00 AM
First name: Brad
Last name: Patterson
Organization:
Title:
Comments: Usfs,

I have been closely following Midas Gold Idaho's plans for several years. I am excited to finally have the opportunity to comment on their Draft EIS. Midas Gold Idaho presents a huge opportunity for the Gem State.

Reviewing the draft environmental impact statement, I believe Alternative 2 is the best choice for Idaho. Alternative 3 would have a larger project footprint, impact more wetlands based on functional units, impact more stream reaches and delay the benefits of the project by two years. Alternative 2 would have less impact on the environment. Alternative 4 is not a good choice because it would put traffic to site right next to the East Fork of the South Fork of the Salmon River. This puts waterways and fish at an unnecessary risk. Alternative 4 also would delay the project unnecessarily. Alternative 5 is not even a realistic option because it would leave the site in the same condition it is today. Right now, fish are blocked from their native spawning grounds and arsenic and antimony are leaching into the ground and surface water. It is unconscionable to think we could leave the area in this state of repair. Alternative 2 would allow Midas Gold to provide critical minerals for the U.S. and clean up the site.

I urge you to accept Midas Gold's plan as outlined under alternative 2 and continue moving this project forward.

Best Wishes,

Name: Brad Patterson